DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 092 TM 002 912

AUTHOR Liberty, Paul G., Jr.; Malone, Lana C.
TITLE The Research vs. Service Dimension: Some Results and Uses of the "I Favor" Scale.
PUB DATE 26 Feb 73
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at annual meeting of National Council on Measurement in Education (New Orleans, Louisiana, 26 February 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Goal Orientation; *Graduate Students; Individual Characteristics; *Interest Scales; *Personality Tests; *Psychological Characteristics; *Rating Scales; Semantic Differential; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS *I Favor Scale

ABSTRACT

This study is concerned with attempting to examine professional work-orientations and personality characteristics of graduate students majoring in counseling and school psychology. Forty-nine graduate students in a required graduate course in psychometrics were asked to respond to the "I Favor" Questionnaire, an instrument that assesses orientations and preferences of individuals toward Research vs. Service, Psychometric vs. Impressionistic, and 23 other dimensions. The scale items are of the bipolar, semantic differential type. Respondents mark their answers along a seven point continuum.Significant (p.10) differences were found on the scales. The results of the analyses are reported. (Author/KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

6B

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 078092

TM 002 912

Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 26, 1973

I. Title: The Research vs. Service Dimension: Some Results and Uses of the "I Favor" Scale -- Paul G. Liberty, Jr. and Lana C. Malone, The University of Texas at Austin.

II. Background: The current accountability emphasis in American education has brought "strange" interdisciplinary professionals together within such innovative educational enterprises as regional educational laboratories, bilingual education projects, dropout prevention projects, and a variety of other special or remedial projects. Not infrequently in such novel settings, conflicting professional interests and task priorities produce serious strains upon organizational cohesiveness and, in turn, upon its goal accomplishment. A number of educational laboratories, and other "applied shops," have suffered severely from this organizational stress that seems to occur when administrators, evaluators, curriculum specialists, teachers, counselors, learning psychologists, and social scientists congregate to do "new and good things" for education. (This statement is based on post-mortem "verdicts" of staff members in struggling and defunct projects and observations of outside evaluators. The authors have performed in both types of situations.) Through social system analysis of organizational dysfunction, the working hypothesis emerged that professional staff members ranged widely along a bipolar continuum that might be labeled Research (R) vs. Service (S). The Service types, it seemed, wished to "crank out" educational materials for immediate use by needy children. The Research types resisted "produce quickly" pressures, insisting instead on a deliberate, developmental, "scientific" approach. Thus, the opposing role perceptions and orientations with the contingent speed of "payoff" strategies of R-type and S-type individuals seemed to provide the setting, or the causal ingredients, for organizational dysfunctioning.

Having had involvement at the preservice and inservice levels with the

training of educational evaluators, educational auditors, administrators, curriculum developers, social scientists, counselors, and others who have migrated to special or innovative projects, the necessity arose for an instrument that might (1) document the perceptions, needs, goals, and modus operandi of various professional groups engaged in interdisciplinary programs, (2) serve as a discussion vehicle in staff training and organizational development activities, and (3) provide some task-approach dimensions that might help prepare graduate students for evaluation positions in educational settings. Experiential data during the past two years served to suggest items that might be incorporated into an instrument that would delineate professional work orientations in applied, interdisciplinary educational settings.

III. Problem: The present study presents an experimental tryout of the latest, 25-item "I Favor" Questionnaire (Liberty, 1972) in a first-year psychometrics course required of all graduate educational psychology students. This course is also the basic course for students advancing to graduate degrees in educational evaluation. Thus, this course was considered to afford a reasonably broad spectrum of R and S preferences, approximating the range existing in the field. The "I Favor" Questionnaire contains one specific R-S item plus other items to delineate the R-S dimension. This study sought to identify facets of R and S-type individuals. Successful explication of various R and S groups on the questionnaire would (1) demonstrate the amenability of the R-S dimension to measurement; (2) provide a degree of construct validity for the dimension; (3) warrant applications of the Questionnaire in training of educational evaluators at the college level; and (4) encourage its use in applied projects in staff development sessions to explicate individual and organizational goals.

IV. Methodology: The "I Favor" Questionnaire consists of 25 bipolar, semantic differential-type scales (items). Each item, or scale, is scored separately and respondents check their preferences along a seven-point answer line for

each item. All 49 students in the required, first-year psychometrics course completed the R-S questionnaire at the start of the Spring Semester 1972 class. This group, therefore, is highly representative of the entire group (1971-72) of entering, first-year, educational pscyhology graduate students at The University of Texas at Austin. The reliability of the instrument and individual scales is assumed to be comparable to those reported by Osgood and his associates with the Semantic Differential scales.

Four groups of students were formed on the basis of their responses to the Research vs. Service item. The groups were: Research (1, 2, 3), Neutral (4), Mildly Service (5), and Highly Service (6, 7). (The response positions on the 1-7 scale are shown in parentheses.) Since the Educational Psychology Department has a predominantly "applied" emphasis, the Counseling and School Psychology are in the majority, S-sided responders were expected to (and did) exceed the number of R-sided responders. Consequently, all the R-sided responses were pooled into the single group, Group I. ANOVAR, one-way, was employed to test for group mean differences. Results are shown in Appendix, Table 1.

V. Results:

(1) Twelve of 24 scales were significant at $P \leq .10$ level. (The R-S scale, serving as the classification measure in this study, is the 25th item on the questionnaire.)

(2) R-types favored, more than S-types, a Psychometric Orientation, Things, Working Alone, Evaluation over Administration, Academic Research, Numbers more than People, Research more than Teaching, Experimental over Clinical, Research over Administration, Basic Research over Applied, and Detail over the Big Picture.

(3) Compared to R-types, Service types favored more the Impressionistic Orientation, People, Working with People, Administration over Evaluation, Action Research, Persons over Numbers, Teaching over Research, Clinical over Experimental, Administration over Research, Applied Research over Basic,

and the Big Picture over Detail.

(4) Generally, the data supported the subjective impressionistic data from field settings, with the Research types emphasizing an attention to detail, numerical assessment, a preference for secluded study, and shying away from direct contact with teachers and other public school personnel and wanting more time for product development. Service types, conversely, want to do quick product development to help kids NOW!

(5) Neutral respondents generally score intermediate between R and S types. They are found to prefer more High Risk situations, Reserved Behavior, Attention to Detail, and Evaluative Research. Generally, they score more like R-types than S-types. (From responses not reported here, Neutral responders were found to be "teacher-pleasers", giving responses that are believed to be valued by the instructor.)

(6) Researcher and Neutral types tend to be older than Service types.

(7) In order to further determine characteristics of R and S responders, the students' responses were related against major or specialty area. Ninety percent of Counseling Psychologists and 60% of School Psychologists were found on the Service side, while 70% of the majors in Human Development, Learning, and Statistics were S-sided.

(8) Evaluation specialists tended to be Mildly-Service, tending to prefer Higher Risks than other groups, Doing rather than Directing, dealing with Many Variables, and Doing Many Things Well rather than Few Things Perfectly. This set of preferences matches the field requirement for the evaluation specialty.

(9) Scale probably needs items pertaining to more caution-less caution, fast-slow, or deliberate-quick, but results are taken to provide construct and content validity for the R-S dimension. Those items that may predict success as an evaluator are of particular interest since training of eval-

uators is currently being emphasized in society. Questionnaire will next be utilized with "pure" psychologists, social scientists, educational administrators, and curriculum specialists at college level, and with those bilingual project evaluators which have been found to be more and less effective in the field.

(10) The scale has immediate utiluty in delineating role orientations in inter-disciplinary situations for purpose of developing understanding and cooperation.

APPENDIX 1

Table 1. ANOVAR Results and Mean Scores of Four Research-Service Groups

	Variable[a]	I Research (N=11)	II Neutral (N=6)	III Mildly Service (N=15)	IV High Service (N=17)	P
	Research vs. Service	2.36	4.00	5.00	6.24	(Classification Variable)
	Age	29.64	30.50	27.27	28.53	.0001
1.	Impressionistic vs. Psychometric	5.20	4.17	4.40	3.82	.06
2.	Basic Laws vs. Individual Differences	4.45	4.17	4.20	4.82	.69
3.	Things vs. People	5.18	6.17	6.33	6.29	.03
4.	Working with People vs. Working Alone	4.27	3.33	3.47	2.47	.03
5.	Administration vs. Evaluation	5.82	4.33	5.47	4.76	.07
6.	Writing vs. Speaking	3.27	3.17	3.93	4.47	.22
7.	Academic Research vs. Action Research	4.73	4.33	5.27	5.47	.10
8.	Product vs. Process	4.64	4.50	3.67	4.53	.26
9.	Persons vs. Numbers	3.27	2.50	2.20	1.65	.01
10.	Applied Research vs. Evaluative Research	3.45	4.17	3.67	3.44	.68
11.	Individual Differences vs. Concern for "Underdog"	2.55	2.60	3.60	3.12	.14
12.	Teaching vs. Research	4.73	3.50	3.07	2.65	.001
13.	Concern for "Underdog" vs. Basic Laws	4.73	4.67	4.13	3.71	.23
14.	Directing vs. Doing	4.73	4.33	4.93	4.06	.38
15.	High Risk vs. Low Risk	3.73	3.00	3.93	3.82	.51
16.	Clinical vs. Experimental	4.55	4.67	2.60	2.00	.0001
17.	Few Variables vs. Many Variables	3.36	3.33	4.27	3.12	.18
18.	Research vs. Administration	1.82	3.67	3.00	4.24	.0003
19.	Reserved Behavior vs. Impulsive Behavior	3.36	3.17	3.60	4.06	.31
20.	Applied Research vs. Basic Research	3.45	4.00	2.27	2.12	.001
21.	Few Things Perfectly vs. Many Things Well	4.64	5.00	5.60	5.47	.44
22.	Detail vs. Big Picture	4.18	3.83	5.07	5.12	.09
23.	Unstructured Tasks vs. Structured Tasks	4.18	4.00	3.73	3.81	.91
24.	Fixed Response vs. Free Response	5.09	4.67	4.73	4.76	.91

[a] The score of seven is assigned to the last named concept in each pair.

"I FAVOR...." SCALE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Research								Service
2. Impressionistic								Psychometric
3. Basic Laws of Behavior								Individual Differences
4. Things								People
5. Working with People								Working Alone
6. Administration								Evaluation
7. Writing								Speaking
8. Academic Research								Action Research
9. Product (the result)								Process (planning, doing)
10. Persons								Numbers
11. Applied Research								Evaluative Research
12. Individual Differences								Concern for "Underdog"
13. Teaching								Research
14. Concern for "Underdog"								Basic Laws of Behavior
15. Directing								Doing
16. High Risk Situations								Low Risk Situations
17. Clinical								Experimental
18. Working With Few Variables at a Time								Working with Many Variables at a Time
19. Research								Administration
20. Reserved Behavior								Impulsive Behavior
21. Applied Research								Basic Research
22. In Action & Speech, Doing Few Things Perfectly								In Action & Speech, Doing Many Things Well
23. Focusing on Detail								Focusing on "Big Picture"
24. Unstructured Tasks								Structured Tasks
25. Fixed Response Tasks								Free Response (open-ended) Tasks